

BDCP Steering Committee Meeting
Friday, August 25, 2006 9:00 to 12:00
Draft Meeting Summary and Action Items

1. Introductions

- See attached list for meeting attendees.

2. Updates

- It was reiterated that the Steering Committee is the main instrument for drafting the Planning Agreement, and that outside counsel is merely a means of implementing the committee's requests.

3. Planning Agreement – Discussion

- Description of August 23 Draft
 - The Steering Committee discussed the text of the draft Planning Agreement dated August 23. This version incorporates agreed upon revisions identified at the last three steering committee meetings, as well as additional comments provided by the Fish Agencies and NGOs.
- Discussion of remaining issues
 - The Steering Committee discussed the remaining 12 broad topics that still need to be resolved in the Planning Agreement:
 1. Geographic scope—A subgroup will convene to resolve this language.
 2. Covered species—Resolved
 3. Interim projects—A subgroup will convene to resolve this language.
 4. Definitions— Resolved
 5. CESA assurances (4.7)— Resolved
 6. BDCP's relationship to CALFED—A subgroup will convene to resolve this language.
 7. Scope of off-ramp (9.8)—The Interim Projects subgroup will address concerns about this section.
 8. Covered activities (7.5)— Resolved
 9. Current law— Resolved pending DFG's validation.
 10. Governance—Anthony Saracino and Bill Boyd to propose language that addresses information sharing amongst Steering Committee members; also need to confirm that the BDCP will not need to meet Federal Advisory Committee Act requirements.
 11. Role of Resources— Resolved
 12. Planning goals— Resolved

4. Next meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for August 31, 2006, from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Please note the early meeting date!

Action Items

- Subgroup to meet to resolve geographic scope language.
- Subgroup to meet to resolve interim scope language.
- Subgroup to meet to resolve the BDCP's relationship to CALFED.
- Steering Committee members should provide Laura King Moon a list of their staff's resources for use in forming future subgroups.

Handouts

- Agenda
- Draft Planning Agreement Dated August 23, 2006
- Letter from environmental organizations dated August 25, 2006

BDCP Steering Committee Meeting
Friday, August 31, 2006 9:00 to 10:30
Draft Meeting Notes

1. Introductions

- See attached list for meeting attendees.

2. Updates

- Subgroups met over the last week to draft language for the following topics:
 - Geographic Scope
 - Interim Projects
 - Relationship to CALFED
 - Scope of Off-ramp
- Minor technical edits were distributed to the Steering Committee. These and other minor edits that the drafting team finds will be fixed in the next version of the Planning Agreement.

3. Final Planning Agreement Discussion

- Remaining issues
 - The Steering Committee discussed the remaining 4 broad topics that still need to be resolved in the Planning Agreement:
 1. Geographic scope—Resolved
 2. Interim projects/scope of off-ramp — Resolved
 3. BDCP's relationship to CALFED— Resolved
 4. Governance— Resolved; FACA requirements to be confirmed.
- A 21-day public comment period for the Planning Agreement will begin after the document is officially finalized at the September 8 Steering Committee meeting.

4. Next meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for September 8, 2006.

Handouts

- Agenda
- Draft Planning Agreement Dated August 29, 2006
- List of minor technical edits
- Planning and Conservation League suggested revisions, dated August 30, 2006

BDCP Steering Committee Meeting
Friday, September 8, 2006 9:00 to 10:30
Draft Meeting Summary and Action Items

1. Introductions

- See attached list for meeting attendees.

2. Updates

- The Planning Agreement is still undergoing Department of Interior legal review, which will occur concurrently with the public comment period.

3. Final Planning Agreement Discussion

- The Steering Committee approved the Planning Agreement, with several minor modifications. The updated Planning Agreement will be sent out with these revisions for public comment and board approvals.
- The Planning Agreement is still considered draft pending public review. DFG will distribute the Notice of Availability on Monday, September 11, 2006, which officially begins the 21 day public comment period. The Planning Agreement will be posted on DFG's website, as well as on CALFED's site and on various email listservs.
- Any comments on DFG's NOA should be provided to Scott Cantrell by 8:00 a.m. on Monday, September 11, 2006.
- Public comments will be reviewed and discussed at the October 6 Steering Committee meeting.

4. Request for Qualifications

- The draft Bay-Delta Conservation Plan Request for Qualifications, with Zone 7 as the contracting agency, was distributed for review. The RFQ is not seeking formal proposals, but rather is opening the door to determine experience and interest only. This is meant to provide the flexibility to find the most qualified consultant or consultant team. The RFQ is intended to mirror the Planning Agreement.
- The workplan and budget subcommittee will be resurrected to manage the RFQ process.
- Any comments should be sent to Laura King Moon by 10:00 on Monday, September 11, 2006.
- The RFQ will be distributed on Monday, September 11, with a link to the Planning Agreement provided on DFG's website. Inform Laura King Moon if there is a specific consultant that you would like to ensure receives the RFQ.

5. Organizational Matters

- Org Chart
A draft BDCP development organizational chart was distributed. The org chart sets the Steering Committee's intention. The PRE's plan to draft the BDCP based on this chart.

- **BDPAC**

The BDPAC will be discussing how the BDCP relates to the Delta Strategic Plan at its meeting next Wednesday, September 13. The BDCP and the Delta Strategic Plan must be coordinated to ensure that the science and scenarios for each are consistent. The preliminary plan for coordination between the BDCP and Strategic Plan will be based on the three S:

- Regular schedule check-ins
 - Delta Vision scenarios
 - Science
- NOAA is aiming to have its draft recovery plan ready for public review by June 2007, and finalized by the end of 2007.
 - The September 13 BDPAC meeting will discuss the Delta Strategic Plan, including how it relates to the BDCP.
 - The USFS is revising its Delta Native Fishes Plan.
 - There will be a one-day POD session on October 24.

6. Other/Public Comments

- PCL representative commented on the current draft Planning Agreement.

7. Next meeting

- The next meeting is scheduled for September 22, 2006 at 9:00 a.m. Topics of this meeting will include presentations on CALFED science, DRERIP, the POD, and the ISB and how they relate to the Delta Strategic Plan. Other briefings will be considered if necessary.

Action Items

- Any comments on DFG's NOA should be provided to Scott Cantrell by 8:00 a.m. on Monday, September 11, 2006.
- Any comments or typos on the draft RFQ should be sent to Laura King Moon by 10:00 on Monday, September 11, 2006.
- Inform Laura King Moon if there is a specific consultant that you would like to ensure receives the RFQ.

Handouts

- Draft Planning Agreement Dated August 29, 2006
- RFQ
- Org Chart
- DFG NOA

BDCP Steering Committee Meeting
Friday, September 22, 2006 9:00 to 10:30
Meeting Notes

1. Introductions

- See attached list for meeting attendees.

2. Overview of Science Structure for the Delta

- Succinct and informative presentations were given on the following:
 - Present governance structure: Cindy Darling, Resources
 - CALFED Science Program and Independent Science Board (ISB): Ron Ott, CALFED Science Program
 - Pelagic Organism Decline (POD) Studies: Ted Sommer, Resources
 - Delta Regional Ecosystem Restoration Implementation Plan (DRERIP): Stuart Seigel
 - Natural Community Conservation Planning Act (NCCPA) Science Requirements: Gail Presley, DFG
 - DFG's *Guidance for the NCCP Independent Science Advisory Process* is available online at <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/nccp/scienceprocess.pdf>
 - Prior scientific advisory reports are available for review online at <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/nccp/science.htm>.
- The Steering Committee will discuss how the BDCP will specifically relate to each of these efforts at a later meeting, as well as how the BDCP will incorporate science into its own efforts.

3. Next meeting

- The next meeting is scheduled for October 6, 2006 at 9:00 a.m. This meeting will include a discussion of public comments on the Planning Agreement, which are due on October 2. The public comments will be circulated to the Steering Committee for review prior to the meeting. The goal of the meeting will be to have a Planning Agreement that is ready to bring to the various board of directors for approval.

4. Public Comment

- PCL representative commented on the need for additional studies in the Delta.

5. Handouts

- Present Governance Structure
- IEP and Science Programs
- Science Program Priorities
- Review Panels
- The Decline of Pelagic Fishes in the San Francisco Estuary: An Update
- DRERIP Products and Schedule
- Independent Scientific Input for Natural Community Conservation Planning

BDCP Steering Committee Meeting
Friday, October 6, 2006, 2006 9:00 to 12:00
Draft Meeting Summary Notes

1. Introductions/Updates

- See attached list for meeting attendees.
- The public comment period for the BDCP closed on October 2. Eighteen comments were received, several comments focused on details of a conservation plan that go beyond the scope of the Planning Agreement. The Planning Agreement establishes the process by which the BDCP will be developed. The details of the actual conservation plan will come as the BDCP document is written. Although no formal written responses to the comments received on the Planning Agreement is required under the NCCPA, DFG and the larger Steering Committee have considered all of comments and several changes are being made to the Planning Agreement as a result (see below).
- All Steering Committee meetings will now be publicly noticed. To be added to the list of Interested Observers, please sign the sign-in sheet at each meeting, or e-mail bethg@resources.ca.gov. E-mail will be the main channel for meeting notices and other information. If you would like to receive a hard copy, please call (916) 653-2784.
- The deadline for consultant RFQs was October 3. Six Statements of Qualifications were received in response to the RFQ. A subset of the Steering Committee will be organized and expects to conduct interviews of the consultant teams the week of October 16.
- Public outreach efforts have begun. Steering Committee members will be tasked to talk to groups. If there is a particular group that you would like to ensure receives a presentation, please let Beth know (bethg@resources.ca.gov).
- DFG received a \$238,000 grant under the USFWS's ESA Section 6 funds for BDCP public outreach.

2. Public Comment

- The floor was opened for public comment. None was received.

3. Final Planning Agreement Discussion

- A list of suggested final changes to the Planning Agreement was distributed. All items were either accepted, or accepted with modifications, by unanimous approval of the Steering Committee. These revisions were incorporated into the final Planning Agreement which was posted at http://resources.ca.gov/docs/BDCP_Planning_Agreement_10.6.06.pdf.
- The final Planning Agreement will be emailed to Steering Committee members to commence individual Board actions for approval. The Steering Committee will proceed without signatures pending Board approvals.
- The next steps for the Steering Committee will be:
 - Evaluate responses to the RFQ
 - Continue discussing covered activities
 - Refine geographic scope and covered species
 - Determine relationship to OCAP and Delta Vision

4. Adjacent NCCP/HCP Presentations

- Linda Fiack from the Delta Protection Commission introduced staff from five adjacent NCCP/HCP areas:
 - Steve Mayo, San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP)
 - Plan Type: HCP
 - Total Acres Covered: 900,000

- Covered Species: 97; includes fish
 - Contact: Steve Mayo, Senior Regional Planner: 209.468.1084; smayo@sicog.org
- John Kopchik, Contra Costa County
 - Plan Type: HCP/NCCP
 - Total Acres Covered: 170,000
 - Covered Species: 28; no fish
- Chris Lee, Solano County Water Agency
 - Plan Type: HCP
 - Total Acres Covered: 580,000
 - Covered Species: 77 species, including fish
- Julia McIver, Yolo County
 - Plan Type: HCP/NCCP
 - Total Acres Covered: 400,000
 - Covered Species: 26 species, no fish
 - Contact: Maria Wong, Executive Director: 530.666.8834
- Vince King, Sacramento County
 - Plan Type: HCP
 - Total Acres Covered: 345,000
 - Covered Species: 41 species, no fish
 - Contact: Richard Radmacher, Project Manager: 916.874.6141
 - Website: www.saccounty.net/planning/habitat-conservation/overview.html
- Additional information about all five plans can be found at www.conservationplanning.info.

5. Next meeting

- The next meeting is scheduled for October 20, 2006, from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Handouts

- Public comments on the Planning Agreement
- List of final changes to the Planning Agreement
- Map of current HCP and HCP/NCCP efforts
- San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan presentation handout
- South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan project summary

Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)
Steering Committee Meeting
Friday, October 20, 2006, 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Draft Meeting Notes

Action Items

- Suggestions for groups that would like a presentation about the BDCP should be e-mailed to b.gerbs@resources.ca.gov.
- Recommendations for the science advisors and facilitator should be sent to Cindy Darling (cindy.darling@resources.ca.gov) and Laura King Moon (laurak@swc.com).
- Steering Committee members should review the Draft Plan for 2006 Environmental Water Account (EWA) Technical Review and e-mail comments to Cindy Darling at Resources (cindy.darling@resources.ca.gov), Ron Ott (ronott@calwater.ca.gov), or Jana Machula (janam@calwater.ca.gov) at CALFED as soon as possible.
- K. Scarborough to distribute a schedule for next quarter's Steering Committee meetings.
- C. Darling to develop a flow chart that illustrates the role of the science advisors and facilitator in relation to the Steering Committee.

1. Introductions/Updates

- See attached list for meeting attendees.
- Information related to the BDCP can now be accessed on the Resources Agency's website at: http://resources.ca.gov/bay_delta_conservation_plan.html.
- BDCP representatives have been conducting briefings for legislative staff and water lobbyists and are planning on briefing environmental lobbyists soon. Anyone who knows of a group that would like to be briefed should e-mail bethg@resources.ca.gov.
- Zone 7 Water Agency's Board of Directors was the first Steering Committee member to approve the Planning Agreement.
- There are still outstanding signatures on the MOA. The Steering Committee is aiming to have all signatures by November.
- Secretary Chrisman recently appointed Michael Healey as CALFED's new lead scientist.

2. Workplan/Budget Sub Group

The Steering Committee Workplan/Budget Subgroup will be conducting consultant interviews on Friday, October 27. The subgroup will aim to have a recommendation by the next Steering Committee meeting. Once a consultant is chosen, the contract will be administered by Zone 7 Water Agency. Zone 7 expects to seek contract approval at their December 20 Board of Directors meeting.

Handout:

- Summary Scope of Work (07.14.06)

3. Science Next Steps

The Steering Committee discussed options for science advisors for the BDCP. The purpose of the science advisors will be to provide the Steering Committee with independent scientific analysis from a broad range of disciplines throughout the planning process. The science advisors will not be responsible for developing the BDCP, but rather for providing guidance to the consultant team and to the Steering Committee as the plan is prepared. The Steering Committee also discussed whether a facilitator should be brought on to facilitate the science advisors and bridge the gap between the advisors and the Steering Committee. There were mixed views on the value of a facilitator, and it was suggested that there be a follow-up presentation with some examples of what role a facilitator would play with regard to science.

While the Steering Committee is still discussing and planning the specifics of how the science advisor process will be structured, all agreed that this is an important foundation for the BDCP and the Steering Committee must take the time to plan accordingly. Meanwhile, recommendations for the science advisors and facilitator should be sent to Cindy Darling (cindy.darling@resources.ca.gov) and Laura King Moon (laurak@swc.com).

Handout:

- Proposed description of Science Advisory Board

Related information:

- To examine independent scientific reports for other NCCPs, visit DFG's website at <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/nccp/science.htm>
- To examine the independent science review of OCAP, visit CALFED's website at:
http://science.calwater.ca.gov/workshop/workshop_ocap.shtml

4. EWA Review

The EWA is undergoing its annual technical review. The focus of this year's review is to determine how effective the EWA has been at addressing biological benefits. Steering Committee members were asked to review the Draft Plan for 2006 EWA Technical Review and determine whether there are technical questions that the EWA should consider in relation to the BDCP. Email comments to Cindy Darling at Resources (cindy.darling@resources.ca.gov), or Ron Ott (ronott@calwater.ca.gov) or Jana Machula (janam@calwater.ca.gov) at the CALFED Science Program as soon as possible.

Handout:

- Draft Plan for 2006 EWA Technical Review (October 19, 2006)

5. Covered Activities Discussion

The Steering Committee continued its discussion about which activities will be covered by the BDCP. The Steering Committee has not yet decided whether the plan should include levees as covered activities. Some also had questions about how reservoir operations would be handled in the analysis. This will continue to be a topic of discussion at future Steering Committee meetings.

Handout:

- Bay-Delta Conservation Planning Agreement, Section 7.5 (Page 16-17) (October 6, 2006)

6. Public Comment

The floor was opened for public comment. A PCL representative stated that the BDCP Science Advisory Board's fundamental question should be how much water the Delta requires under varying conditions. Based on the answer to this question, it can then begin answering other questions.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for November 17, from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Please note that Steering Committee meetings now will occur monthly, with meetings in between as necessary. A schedule for next quarter's meetings will be distributed soon.

Handouts

- Summary Scope of Work (July 14, 2006)
- Proposed description of Science Advisory Board
- Draft Plan for EWA technical review (October 19, 2006)
- Bay Delta Conservation Planning Agreement Covered Activities (October 6, 2006)

Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)
Steering Committee Meeting
Friday, November 17, 2006, 9:00 a.m. to 10:30 p.m.
Draft Meeting Notes

Action Items

- T. Quinn to look into establishing a covered activities subgroup.
- R. Strach to compile a preliminary list of scientific questions to be answered by the future science advisors. Send suggested questions to Russ at russ.strach@noaa.gov.

1. Introductions/Updates

- See attached list for meeting attendees.
- National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) signed the planning agreement; others are in the process of being submitted.
- The 2007 schedule and workplan are currently being developed and will be distributed soon.

2. Recommendation of the Consultant Selection Committee

The Steering Committee met in a closed session to discuss consultant selection. The Steering Committee accepted the recommendation of the Selection Committee. Consultants will be notified this afternoon about the results.

3. Covered Activities Discussion (informational only)

The Steering Committee continued its discussion about covered activities. The discussion covered whether levees should be included under the BDCP, how the BDCP will overlap and coordinate with DWR's levee work, how the BDCP will benefit from the recently approved Proposition 1E, and how the BDCP will overlap and coordinate with the re-consultation on OCAP. It was agreed that levees will not be included as a covered activity. No other decisions were made today, but all agreed that it is important to keep this discussion in the forefront of Steering Committee's agenda. The Steering Committee likely will be establishing a covered activities subcommittee in January to help sift through these issues and propose recommendations.

4. Science Discussion (informational only)

To help the Steering Committee design its independent science advisory process, representatives from two similar efforts gave presentations on how their science process is structured.

South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project, presented by Steve Richie

The South Bay Salt Restoration Project is led by the Coastal Conservancy, along with the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The management team includes representatives from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Santa Clara Valley Water District, Alameda County Flood Control District, and a lead scientist. The project also receives significant funding from private donors.

The primary focus of this project's science is to ensure that the salt pond restoration project is scientifically sound and publicly accepted. S. Richie emphasized the importance of remaining flexible in the scientific approach, because the outcome is not always what you originally expected. Their approach is a combination of asking a science panel specific questions and requesting general scientific advice. The science process is broken up into four different levels:

1. *A local science team.* This group consists of scientists who are familiar with the local study area. They are charged with listing the fundamental uncertainties of the project—the top three of which are mercury contamination, sediment dynamics, and the balance of habitat. To address these uncertainties, the local science team developed 21 applied studies questions that form the basis of the project's scientific research. This team meets roughly every 2 months.
2. *A national science panel.* This group consists of scientists chosen nationwide from a broad range of expertise. This team is charged with looking at the "big picture" science. The group met five times over the 3-year planning period and will meet less often as the project progresses.

3. *A lead scientist on the management team.* This person has a formal seat on the management team and serves as the bridge between the science team and management.
4. *A long-term science management team.* This group collects information and provides advice, similar to CALFED's Science Program. This team is engaged by all three of the above levels.

This project engages a facilitator for its stakeholder group, but all of the science teams discussed above are self-managed. The facilitator serves as the bridge between the stakeholder group and the science teams and promotes an open exchange of information between the two groups. This open process was appreciated by the stakeholder group.

For more information, visit: <http://www.southbayrestoration.org/>

Yolo County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP), presented by Maria Wong

The Yolo County HCP/NCCP is headed by a joint powers authority (JPA) made up of Yolo County and its four incorporated cities, with U.C. Davis as an *ex officio* member. This effort is a re-start HCP/NCCP that is underpinned by science, economics, and public policy. In the first phase, science was a highly contentious component that remained unresolved when the effort restarted. In the re-start, the JPA aimed for a process that would provide unbiased scientific opinion to the project, while at the same time not overpowering entire process. To achieve this, a working group (made up of Maria Wong and DFG and USFWS representatives) established the following process:

1. The group first chose a lead scientist. The lead scientist was engaged 3 to 4 months prior to selecting the science advisors and helped determine the scope of work and the limitations and boundaries of the group.
2. Next, the group devised a vetting process for choosing the science advisors. This process was designed to include a broad perspective on an ecosystem level (not just specific species) and included both local and out-of-state scientists pulled from academia, public agencies, and private practice. M. Wong emphasized that having such a broad list to choose from strengthened their science process.
3. Finally, the working group established their steering committee as the gatekeeper for all questions. The steering committee posed their questions to the lead scientist, and the lead scientist then decided which questions to bring forward to the science advisors. These questions focused primarily on global issues about the plan, rather than specific details like impacts of a particular activity.

The scientific process was headed by the lead scientist, followed by a second scientist (chosen by the lead). A facilitator provided editing, meeting coordination, and facilitation.

A key element of the scientific process was the JPA's ability to preview the science advisors' recommendations prior to going public. This allowed the JPA to refine the document and clean it up before public review. M. Wong emphasized the importance of engaging a technical writer in this part of the process.

The science advisors were not constrained by cost or feasibility issues, in part to address a perception that the original HCP/NCCP science was limited. The next step will be for the JPA to review the science advisors' recommendations and determine what is feasible given the available resources.

For more information, visit: <http://www.city.davis.ca.us/yolohabitatjpa/>

6. Public Comment

K. Scarborough received an email comment from the Planning Conservation League (PCL). No other comments were received.

7. Next Meeting

The next meetings are scheduled for December 15, 2006, and January 19, 2007.

Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)
Steering Committee Meeting
Friday, December 15, 2006, 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.
Draft Meeting Notes

Key Decisions

- Three subgroups were formed: Workplan, Science, and Membership.

Action Items

- SAIC will put together a communications memo that outlines the communication protocol between Laura King Moon, SAIC, and the various Steering Committee parties.
- A request was made for a one-page summary of the draft workplan.
- Strive to finalize the workplan by January 12, 2007.
- Provide workplan comments to Workplan and Budget Subgroup representatives. Those not involved with the subgroup should send comments to Cindy Darling at cindy.darling@resources.ca.gov.
- Cindy Darling and Karen Scarborough will email a list of new subgroup members.

1. Introductions/Updates

- See attached list for meeting attendees.
- The Steering Committee received all signatures on the Planning Agreement. The final Planning Agreement will be distributed soon.
- The Steering Committee will be meeting every two weeks in 2007, starting on January 12. These slots will also potentially be used for subgroup meetings depending on the best use of those dates.
- Santa Clara Valley Water District is the third and final PRE to authorize the Cooperative Agreement. This agreement defines the PRE's percentage of payment to the consultant and governs the next few steps in the relationship with the consultant.
- Delta Vision is aiming to announce a blue ribbon task force and a list of stakeholders by the end of the year.

2. Consultant Introduction

The Steering Committee selected Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) as the BDCP consultant. The SAIC team is headed by Paul Cylinder, who is the head of SAIC's Western Natural Resources Planning and Management Group. Pete Rawlings will serve as the Deputy Project Manager for the SAIC team.

Laura King Moon will serve as SAIC's point of contact for the Steering Committee. Direction from the Steering Committee, when not provided at Steering Committee meetings, should be communicated through Laura.

3. Draft Workplan Review

The Steering Committee reviewed SAIC's *Draft Bay-Delta Conservation Plan Work Plan* (Dated 12.12.06). This is not the actual plan, but rather provides the statement of work, schedule, and assumptions for tasks for SAIC to prepare the BDCP, including:

- Task 1: Project Management
- Task 2: Support Public Involvement and Outreach Program (to be supported by a separate contract)
- Task 3: Support Science Advisory Process (to be supported by a separate contract)
- Task 4: Covered Activities
- Task 5: Ecological Baseline and Data Compilations and Report
- Task 6: Impact Assessment
- Task 7: Conservation Strategy

- Task 8: Economic Analysis
- Task 9: Draft Bay-Delta Conservation Plan
- Task 10: Final Bay-Delta Conservation Plan

SAIC noted the Steering Committee's concerns and changes to the document. The Steering Committee established a Workplan subgroup, which will continue to refine the draft workplan. Additional changes should be emailed to your Workplan subgroup representative, who will bring them to the next subgroup meeting (date TBD). The intent is to implement these revisions and bring a final work plan draft to the January 12 Steering Committee meeting.

Action Items

- SAIC will put together a communications memo that outlines the communication protocol between Laura King Moon, SAIC, and the various Steering Committee parties.
- A request was made for a one-page summary of the draft workplan.
- Strive to finalize the workplan by January 12, 2007.
- Provide workplan comments to Workplan and Budget Subgroup representatives. Those not involved with the subgroup should send comments to Cindy Darling at cindy.darling@resources.ca.gov.

4. Science Subgroup Creation

The Steering Committee will establish a Science subgroup, with members from the four main sectors. This group will examine in more detail the Steering Committee's approach to the science process, including whether to use an existing CALFED science panel or establish its own independent process.

Action Items:

- Cindy Darling and Karen Scarborough will email a list of Science subgroup members.

5. Steering Committee Membership Process

The Steering Committee will establish a Membership subgroup to determine the Steering Committee's process for adding new members. This process must be inclusive, value-added, and support the current process as-is with no changes. The intent is to have this process pinned down by early next year.

The California Farm Bureau and Defenders of Wildlife both expressed interest in joining the Steering Committee.

6. Public Comment

- Serge Birk from the Central Valley Project Water Association voiced concern about using the best available data to make long-term planning decisions.
- David Bolland from the Association of California Water Agencies expressed support for conservation planning and the BDCP. ACWA will continue to communicate with the water industry and beyond; and to report its members' concerns to the BDCP.
- Jackie McDoldald from Somach, Simmons & Dunn requested that the workplan (specifically, the first assumption on the last page) remain consistent with the Planning Agreement.

7. Next Meeting

The next meetings are scheduled for January 12 and January 26, 2007. Meetings for 2007 are scheduled on an every-other-Friday basis.

Handouts SAIC's *Draft Bay-Delta Conservation Plan Work Plan* (Dated 12.12.06)

Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)
Steering Committee Meeting
Friday, January 12, 2007, 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
Draft Meeting Notes

Action Items/Key Decisions

- The Steering Committee approved the SAIC *Draft Bay-Delta Conservation Plan Work Plan* (Dated 01.09.07) once SAIC implements requested revisions.
- A request was made for the Steering Committee to consider the appeal process if an applicant is denied membership.
- SAIC will review the schedule again in light of this comment to ensure that review periods are realistic with weekend and holiday schedules.
- All agreed that Steering Committee members need commit to working together to meet the aggressive time schedule.
- The Steering Committee will set up future subgroups on the following topics:
 - Regulatory baseline
 - Covered activities
 - Adaptive management
- Marc Ebbin is in the process of developing a white paper to identify baseline implications.

Introductions/Updates

See attached list for meeting attendees.

Draft Workplan Review

The Steering Committee reviewed the changes that SAIC and the Workplan Subgroup implemented to SAIC's *Draft Bay-Delta Conservation Plan Work Plan* (Dated 01.09.07). SAIC noted the Steering Committee's additional revision requests. The Steering Committee approved the workplan once these revisions are implemented.

Membership Committee Report

The Steering Committee reviewed the Membership Subgroup's *Recommendations Regarding Membership on the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan Steering Committee* (dated 01.12.07). A request was made for the Steering Committee to consider the appeal process if an applicant is denied membership.

Schedule

The Steering Committee reviewed SAIC's *Working Schedule for Bay-Delta Conservation Plan* (dated 01/09/07). The Steering Committee's goal is to complete 75% of the conservation strategy framework by the end of 2007. This will be based on the Steering Committee's agreed-upon approaches to overall strategy, covered activities, and the ecological baseline.

Concern was expressed about how realistic the current schedule is, given agency turnaround during weekends and holidays. SAIC emphasized that review times are based on the expected level of effort for each review period, and that the review times during the holiday season are expected to require a lower level of effort than in the beginning. However, SAIC will review the schedule again in light of this comment.

All agreed that Steering Committee members will need commit to working together to meet the aggressive time schedule.

Additional Points

- The Steering Committee will set up future subgroups on the following topics:
- Regulatory baseline
- Covered activities
- Adaptive management
- Marc Ebbin is in the process of developing a white paper to identify baseline implications.

Public Comment

- David Briggs from Contra Costa Water District expressed support of the BDCP effort as a whole and requested that the Steering Committee consider how the plan will address water quality. Detailed comments can be found in *Contra Costa Water District's comment letter on draft BDCP work plan* (dated 01.05.07).
- Kenny Watkins from the California Farm Bureau reiterated his agency's support of the proposed Steering Committee membership process and emphasized that getting the public process going is vital.
- Matt Vandersluis from PCL provided numerous comments on the workplan on matters related to public involvement, project timing, conservation strategies, and the health of the Delta.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for January 26, 2007 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. This meeting will involve a deeper discussion of conservation strategy goals.

Handouts

- SAIC's Draft Bay-Delta Conservation Plan Work Plan (Dated 01.09.07)
- Recommendations Regarding Membership on the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan Steering Committee (dated 01.12.07)
- Working Schedule for Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (dated 01/09/07)
- Flood Control, Water Supply, and Conveyance fact sheet
- Contra Costa Water District's comment letter on draft BDCP work plan (dated 01.05.07)

Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)

Steering Committee Meeting

Friday, January 26, 2007, 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
Draft Meeting Notes

Action Items

- Tim Quinn and Ann Hayden will work with the Membership Subgroup to implement changes to the draft membership criteria, consider requests to be added to the Steering Committee and provide a report back to the Steering Committee.
- Ron Ott will distribute or post the "Diversion Effects on Fish" study for review.
- NGOs will send their goals to Ms. Scarborough.
- A Conservation Strategy workgroup, chaired by Walt Wadlow and Anthony Saracino, should convene before the next Steering Committee meeting to discuss conservation goals.

Key Agreements/Decisions

- All supported the concept of species recovery, but it remains to be seen if it will be possible for the BDCP to achieve recovery.
- All agreed that assigning metrics to the BDCP's goal statements will be a valuable tracking mechanism; Santa Clara Valley Water District's experience assigning metrics to their HCP goals will be a valuable guide.
- All agreed that the Fish Agencies' goals are a good place to start, as larger goals to be further refined.
- There was general agreement that the BDCP should explore the possibility of an alternate conveyance, but that this should not pre-empt current Delta vision process.
- There was general agreement that the Steering Committee should consider a range of alternatives, even if they are inconsistent with planning goals.

Introductions/Updates

- See attached list for meeting attendees.
- The SAIC contract should be signed soon, which will allow them to start moving forward with implementing the workplan.
- Meeting notes from the past several meetings will be distributed soon. These notes will be a hybrid of detailed meeting minutes and key decisions.
- CALFED has started reviewing the first seven years of its 30 year implementation plan, including an analysis of whether through-Delta conveyance is working. The draft report is expected in September 2007.
- DFG briefed the Steering Committee on the discovery of Quagga Mussels in Lake Mead in January. These mussels are highly invasive and have the potential to cause large environmental and economic impacts. They can be transported by water conveyance and by trailered boats. California has launched a unified response under its incident command system, including border inspection stations near Lake Mead and the California/Nevada border in Truckee, dive survey teams, and public information aimed at the boating community.

Membership Committee Report

The Steering Committee discussed the Membership Subgroup's criteria for admitting new members to the Steering Committee. All agreed to make the following additions to these criteria:

- Applicants would be required to accept all past Steering Committee decisions upon acceptance;
- Applicants should be given the opportunity to meet with Steering Committee members to learn more about the application process;
- Applicants should be given the ability to appeal to the Membership Subgroup and/or the Steering Committee if their application is denied;
- Modify Item #2 to refer to the planning goals.

Action Item: Tim Quinn and Ann Hayden will work with the Membership Subgroup to implement these changes to the draft criteria, consider any requests to add members to the Steering Committee, and provide a report back to the Steering Committee.

Conservation Strategy

SAIC facilitated the first of a series of discussions aimed to identify the Steering Committee's conservation and potential strategies for the BDCP, with the intent of setting clear, accomplishable expectations for the plan. These meetings will continue through March, leading to a guidance report that will serve as the Steering Committee's direction to SAIC about the potential conservation strategies. SAIC expects to propose a range of possible BDCP strategies, then brainstorm and possibly suggest alternate approaches that may not have been considered yet. It was stressed that this effort is exploratory at this point, and that no final decisions will be made on the BDCP's final approach until all agreed-upon options are discussed. .

As part of this discussion, the Steering Committee reviewed the Fish Agencies' draft goals handout, which were based on the CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program's Strategic Plan (<http://calwater.ca.gov/programs/ecosystemrestoration/ecosystemvol3restorationplan.shtml>; page 23). The intent of this handout was to frame the Fish Agencies' issues and demonstrate what their collective goals have been in the past. USFWS also encouraged a more rigorous approach to looking at multiple alternatives, similar to the 1998 study "Diversion Effects on Fish". This study looked at four alternatives, including 1) Current conveyance 2) SDIP; 3) an isolated conveyance facility; and 4) the "preferred program" which included SDIP type improvements plus a screened diversion at Hood.

The majority of this discussion centered on covered activities, covered species, planning area, environmental baseline, expectations for recovery, expectations for mitigation, and project funding.

Decisions/Agreements:

- All supported the concept of species restoration, but it remains to be seen if it will be possible for the BDCP to achieve full restoration.
- All agreed that assigning metrics to the BDCP's goal statements will be a valuable tracking mechanism; Santa Clara Valley Water District's experience assigning metrics to certain BDCP goals will be a valuable guide.

- All agreed that the Fish Agencies' goals are a good place to start, as larger goals to be further refined.
- There was general agreement that one BDCP goal should explore the possibility of alternate conveyance, but that this should not pre-empt current Delta vision process.
- There was general agreement that the Steering Committee should consider various alternatives, even if they are inconsistent with planning goals.

Action Items:

- Ron Ott will distribute or post the "Diversion Effects on Fish" study as background information.
- NGOs will send their goals to Ms. Scarborough.

Workgroup Status Report

- A new Conservation Strategy Subgroup was established, co-chaired by Walt Wadlow and Anthony Saracino.
- The Science Workgroup will meet soon.
- The Membership Workgroup will modify the membership criteria as discussed in today's meeting.
- The Workplan & Budget Workgroup will meet as necessary.

Public Comment

- Kenny Watkins from the California Farm Bureau supported the Steering Committee's changes to the membership criteria and announced his agency's submittal of a formal letter of interest to Ms. Scarborough.
- Matt Vandersluis from PCL requested that the Steering Committee consider the human impacts to the health of the Delta and to keep the focus of conservation goals on larger issues such as how much water the Delta needs.

Next Meeting

The next meeting scheduled for February 9 has been cancelled. The next meeting will occur on February 23, 2007 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Handouts

- Final BDCP Workplan
- Draft Fishery Agency Goals and Objectives for the BDCP
- Quagga Mussel Incident PowerPoint

Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)

Steering Committee Meeting

Draft Meeting Summary Notes

February 23, 2007, 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Action Items and Key Decisions

- Science Subgroup should convene to address role of science in BDCP process with following charge:
 - To ensure BDCP process is structured to achieve NCCP science requirements
 - To make recommendations on where/how independent scientific input occur in BDCP process
- Meeting documents will be sent with meeting notes in future; Resources Agency staff will determine which documents should be posted on website

1. Introductions and Updates

- See attached document (02.23.07 list of attendees.xls) for list of meeting attendees
- 2/9/07 Steering Committee meeting was substituted with a Conservation Strategy Subgroup meeting
- Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force (DV) official announcement occurred last week
 - First meeting will be 3/1/07
 - 41 stakeholders
 - DV scope includes land use, governance, long-term vision for Delta management, while BDCP focuses on coordinating permitting agreement and resources protection
 - Karen Scarborough will be coordinating with DV

2. Science Presentation and Discussion

Delta Regional Ecosystem Restoration Implementation Plan (DRERIP): Scientifically Evaluating Restoration Actions

Prof. Denise Reed (University of New Orleans, Earth Sciences Department)

- Program started in 2002, result of Ecosystem Restoration Plan (ERP) Strategic Plan
- Led by four research scientists working with multiple resource agencies
- Product: peer-reviewed science tools (conceptual models for species, habitats, and processes) used to evaluate actions, identify knowledge gaps, facilitate adaptive management, engage wide array of experts to distill ecological knowledge/data into usable conceptual models
- Key benefits of DRERIP-BDCP collaboration and information-sharing:

- Conceptual models will be complete by June 2007 and will be usable for BDCP for impact analysis, setting biological objectives, and developing conservation measures
- Many Delta experts are engaged in the conceptual model development
- Scientific review processes is used
- Incorporation of science-based models will complement the policy process
- Project is supported by fish and wildlife agencies
- Pooling expertise will expedite and improve outcomes
- Question and answer session focused on where and how DRERIP conceptual models can be incorporated into BDCP process, and distinguishing between conceptual models and their uses from predictive and quantitative models and their uses.

3. Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) Presentation and Discussion

Envisioning Futures for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta

Prof. Jay Lund (University of California, Davis, Civil and Environmental Engineering Department)

- A new understanding of Delta has emerged in last decade; freshwater model no longer seen as a viable management strategy
- PPIC worked with academic researchers to analyze and model most current environmental science and water and agricultural economics in Delta, then identified opportunities for promising new solutions to management challenges
- Report published February 2007
- Nine representative management alternatives were identified, including:
 - 3 freshwater Delta alternatives,
 - 3 fluctuating Delta alternatives, and
 - 3 reduced water-exports alternatives
- Most promising, according to PPIC analysis, were fluctuating Delta alternatives including "Peripheral Canal Plus" and "South Delta Aqueduct"
- Key recommendations:
 - Focus on promising alternatives and combine for best benefit
 - Increase technical analysis, research and development for problem-solving
 - Enhance regional and state-wide representation in Delta planning process
 - Implement "beneficiaries-pay" model
 - Establish mitigation mechanisms because benefits will not be universal
 - Incorporate some "no-regrets" actions into any plan, including:
 - Emergency preparedness
 - "Do not resuscitate" strategy for some of the Delta islands
 - Change land-use to focus on
 - Flood control for urbanization and
 - Habitat protection
 - Habitat restoration
- Question and answer session focused on ability of economic models to analyze costs and benefits of possible BDCP conservation alternatives and conservation measures

- PPIC report available at <http://www.ppic.org>

4. Conservation Strategy (CS) Subgroup Update and Discussion

BDCP governance reminder from Karen Scarborough: Steering Committee is responsible for all decision-making; Subgroups undertake analysis and make recommendations to the Steering Committee

Anthony Saracino (co-chair CS Subgroup) reported on the 2/9/07 Subgroup meeting. The main components of that meeting were:

- Presentation and definitions of terms used in BDCP
 - Discussion was productive but not complete
 - Goal of next meeting is to finalize recommended Conservation Goals
- Discussion of Conservation Strategy alternatives decision-making process
 - Recommendation from committee will be to carry forward several Conservation Strategy alternatives through summer 2007 in order to better parallel other planning processes
- Brief and unfinished discussion of whether an Isolated Facility/Peripheral Canal would be considered a Covered Activity or Conservation Measure or both

Presentation: Definition of terms, planning process, and schedule

Paul Cylinder (of SAIC) reviewed information provided at CS Subgroup meeting including key definitions for BDCP, deliverables and tasks in this planning process, and the timeline for deliverables from the consultants. Planning Goals include conservation and stakeholder goals. Conservation Goals lead to (in order of specificity), Biological Goals, and Objectives. Conservation Measures are the specific actions implemented to achieve Biological Goals and Objectives.

The next meeting of the CS Subgroup will be 2/26/07 from 12:00pm to 3:00pm in the DWR Conference Room (Resources Building, 1416 9th St, Room 1131, Sacramento).

5. Membership Subgroup Update

Tim Quinn (co-chair Membership Subgroup) reported that Subgroup had met, reviewed applications from Farm Bureau and Defenders of Wildlife, interviewed applicants, and would be making recommendation to the Steering Committee to accept both applicants.

Statement from Kim Delfino (State Director, Defenders of Wildlife):

Defenders of Wildlife supports regional planning, wants to see it work, and has experience in this type of planning. They are fairly new to Delta systems, but have experience in Colorado River and Salton Sea. They appreciate the changes that were made to the planning agreement based on their comments, which were thorough and critical, and accept the planning agreement as it stands now. They believe a successful outcome to BDCP is possible, though will be difficult, and appreciate opportunity to apply to be an official part of the process.

Statement from Kenny Watkins (2nd President, Farm Bureau): The Farm Bureau is committed to working on BDCP process, representing farmers in the Delta and south of the Delta. They bring expertise to the process through their many years of negotiations, and are committed to bringing the science and what's learned in this committee back to the farming constituency.

There will not be a full report from the Subgroup on the application process but they will circulate a summary of activities.

6. Next Steps- Other Matters

Discussion of whether to convene Science Subgroup and what its charge would be. Decision was made to convene Subgroup. See Action Items for charge to Subgroup.

7. Meeting Notes Review and Approval

Meeting notes from January were approved. Request made that documents associated with Steering Committee meeting be sent out with meeting summaries. Cindy Darling noted that some of those documents can be posted on the BDCP website. BDCP coordinating staff will determine which documents will be posted. See Action Items for full decision statement.

8. Public Comments

Matt Vander Sluis (Planning and Conservation League). PCL supports the Conservation Strategy Subgroup recommendation to move forward with multiple conservation strategies in the near term. They would like to learn what Conservation Strategies have been in other processes so they can calm people's fears about the size of the decisions being made in this early stage of BDCP process. The reason for the comment is a PPIC report co-author has said he thinks it will take 1-2 years to really flesh out the alternatives in their report, which is longer than the BDCP time frame for determining a final CS. PCL recommends that BDCP process consider historical conditions and future constraints, and integrate historical data and climate change in decision-making. Finally: would like to hear further discussion on the finalized BDCP Work Plan. K. Scarborough responded that the Work Plan is in final form but will continue to evolve, as needed.

Dave Briggs (Contra Costa Water District): CCWD recommends looking at a broad range of alternatives, not a narrow one. Specifically, they would like to see more distinctions between fluctuating and freshwater Delta alternatives.

Next Meeting

March 9, 2007, 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Same location (Room 1131, Resources Building).